

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 19-24 are pending and rejected. Claims 1-18 and 25-30 were previously cancelled. The drawings are objected to.

Claims 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and second paragraph. Claims 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Albrecht et al., (hereinafter “Albrecht”), US Pat. No. 5,821,494. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Albrecht or Ainslie et al., (hereinafter “Ainslie”), US Pat. No. 4,761,699.

First, with regard to the objection to the Figures, Applicants submit the objection is incorrect and should be withdrawn. The description and Figures both refer to Figures 1, 2A, 2B, and 3. Applicants submit there is no need to relabel any of the drawings.

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraph rejections of claim 19, Applicants submit that the Figures (*e.g.*, Figure 1) and its related description clearly describe an embodiment including, among other things, traces that extend along the lateral edges of the slider. Applicants submit that the relevant limitations are sufficiently described in the specification and are not indefinite. The § 112 rejections should be withdrawn.

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of claim 19, the Office Action asserts Albrecht shows a plurality of traces 74A extending longitudinally along generally the center of the suspension, and around the outer edges of the slider 42 to the trailing edge of the slider, citing Figures 21A, 21B, 21C and column 9, lines 10-53. *See* Office Action dated 3/23/2009, paragraph 6. Applicants disagree.

First, with regard to the Figures, Applicants note none of the cited Figures teach or suggest the relevant limitations. In particular, in each of the cited embodiments, the trace connection 74a follows generally along the outside of the suspension – *away* from the lateral edges of the slider 42. Indeed, the traces are further extended away from the slider in that they are placed above the suspension post extensions that extend laterally away from the suspension body. *See e.g.*, Figure 21B. Therefore, none of the cited Figures teach or suggest an suspension embodiment wherein a plurality of traces extend longitudinally generally along the center of a suspension and extend along the lateral edges of a slider to a trailing edge of the slider (as described in claim 19). The cited section of the description describes the discussed Figure 21A-21C, and therefore fails to teach or suggest the relevant limitations for similar reasons.

Ainslie fails to make up for the deficiencies of Albrecht. The Office Action asserts Ainslie shows a plurality of traces 52, 55, and 54 extending longitudinally along generally the center of the suspension 40, and underneath and around the outer edges of the slider 42 to the trailing edge of the slider 26. *See* Office Action dated 9/3/2008, paragraph 9. Applicants disagree.

With regard to the Figures, similar to the Albrecht reference discussed above, Applicants note none of the cited Figures teach or suggest the relevant limitations. For example, in Figure 1, the trace connection 34 clearly follows not along the lateral edges of the slider 24, but rather *perpendicular* to the lateral edges. Indeed, the traces are further extended away from the slider perpendicularly and brought back to electrically connect the slider. Similarly, Figure 2 shows traces 52, 54, and 55 extending perpendicular to the lateral edges of slider 16. Therefore, none of the cited Figures teach or suggest an suspension embodiment wherein a plurality of traces

Application No.: 09/741,684
Amendment After Final dated: June 23, 2009
Reply to Office Action of March 23, 2009

extend longitudinally generally along the center of a suspension and extend along the lateral edges of a slider to a trailing edge of the slider (as described in claim 19). The cited section of the description describes the discussed Figures 2 and 3, both of which fail to teach or suggest the relevant limitations for reasons similar to those discussed above.

As the cited references fail to teach or describe at least the above limitations, the current rejection of claim 19 is lacking and should be withdrawn. Applicants submit claim 19 is allowable, and claims 20-24 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim. Applicants respectfully reconsider the claims in light of the current amendments and withdraw the current rejections.

It is believed that this Amendment places the application in condition for allowance, and early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: June 23, 2009

By: /Sumit Bhattacharya/
Sumit Bhattacharya
(Reg. No. 51,469)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501